

DEISM Defeated,

AND CHRISTIANITY Defended;

*OR, THE
Evidence for Christianity set in a New
Light and proved to amount to Certainty;*

*AND THE
Present Controversy between Dr. TINDAL,
Dr. WATERLAND, and others, relating
to the Case between Reason and Reve-
lation stated and solved.*

Occasion'd by a late Pamphlet, Entituled,

*A Demonstration of the Insufficiency both of
Reason and Revelation, Separately or jointly
consider'd, in Matters of Religion. With
a Conclusion shewing what is sufficient.*

*Detecting that Author, by the Principles of his
Pamphlet, to be an Infidel in a Quaker's Coat.*

*By JOHN HENLEY, M. A.
Late of St. John's College, Cambridge.*

L O N D O N,

*Printed: And Sold by J. ROBERTS, near the
Oxford Arms in Warwick-lane.*

MDCCXXXI.

(Price Six-pence.)

Mr. Wm. G. Brewster
of me a medal
called perpetuity copy
crabony, that is, for every
Sunday, for himself &
family, while he lived,
be presenting to the University
of Cambridge, or receiving
a consideration
Copy-right of this
lecture, with liberty
of dedicating the medal to
be forfeited, if others used
it, & if Copy-right also.



To the Right Honourable the
Lord *WILMINGTON*,
Lord P R E S I D E N T
O F
*His M A J E S T Y's most
Honourable Privy-Council,*
T H I S
L E C T U R E

Is Humbly Inscrib'd

By His Lordship's

Most Obedient and

Most Humble Servant,

J. HENLEY.

Luke xiii. 8.

When they saw of many come up, Jesus saith unto them,

THIS Legge is occation'd by
a Discou'ret'ry b'gning
Euangelie, & the coming of
the Kingdome of Br'g'ln
in Reg'ns, & in f'mly cor-
ner'd, in M'nt's of R'gn', with a
mult' of people, b'gning m'nt in f'f'c'nt
l'pe D'f'ns & Up'e'lers raving t'p
a'g'nt W' th' a'g'nt A'ct'uele g's'nt'g R'e-
g'ion, some incide'nt' Freeedom of t'p
L'ng'nd may be b'g'ng'ple in De-
m'ce of it, supp'rted by Br'g'ln, and
the Est'nt'g of the Prop'lt'.

My first Remark on the Title is
that it shew's the Inu'm'nt'c'nt' of the

Prop'lt'.

~~THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCHES OF JESUS CHRIST
BY EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA
IN EIGHT VOLUMES
TRANSLATED FROM THE GREEK
INTO ENGLISH BY DR. J. B. BOSWELL,
WITH NOTES AND A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH
BY DR. J. B. BOSWELL.~~

LUKE xviii. 8.

When the Son of man cometh, will he find faith on the earth?

THIS Lecture is occasion'd by a Discourse, lately publish'd, Entituled, *A Demonstration of the Insufficiency both of Reason and Revelation, separately or jointly consider'd, in Matters of Religion, with a Conclusion, shewing what is sufficient.* The Deists and Unbelievers having set up for great Wit and Acuteness against Religion, some incidental Freedom of that Tendency may be pardonable, in Defense of it, supported by Reason, and the Learning of the Problem.

My first Remark on the Title, is, that it shews the Insufficiency of the

All-

Author's Modesty, and the Sufficienty of his Consciential He opens his Publication with a Paradox, for Surprize and Curiosity, to catch the unwary Fish with the Hair of Free-thinking, and Traffic on the Fancy.

The Title is larded with an illecock'd Mixture from Shaftesbury, the Bible, and the Thirty Nine Articles, to take in the Deist, the Christian, and the Churchman; the first Motto, like the Title, fights with it self: "Philosopher, where are thy Ideas? Where is Truth, Certainty, Evidence so much talk'd of?" In that Free-thinking Catechism, may Lord Shaftesbury would prove the Children of this World, wiser than the Children of Light. Yet he only trends in the Steps of Des Cartes, the French Free-thinker, who first doubted of his own Being, to lay the Foundation of Certainty in Uncertainty, by his language, and pause to ask himself a wise Question, whether there was such a Thing as Devil Cartes in the World?

the

the Cause was, like the Case of the Deists; being doat of himself, he could noo determine, whether he was at all.

And Des Cartes, in this only follow'd the old Pyrrhonists, and retail'd a thin woor-ott Remnant of that curious Seeker, who never found, that successful Runner after Truth, who never over-took it. Sextus Empiricus: Yet the Deists would be thought New and Wise, than their Forefathers, the Academicks of Athens, who were not new above 2000 Years before; and tho' they are old enough to be now wiser, they are got no farther, than the old Question, What is Truth, like Pilate, or where is Evidence, in the Phrase of *Magistrate Cooper?*

Theze are the Men that would instruct us, that they profess they know nothing; they are now sure, they ask thew Question; & we are dlikely to be taught by Deists, and grounded in Faith by Infidels. They are so farre modell, indeed,

indeed, as to be Professors of Ignorance, they let us know what Wisdom we are to expect from them.

Where is Certainty, so much talk'd of, says Shaftesbury? his ~~oruning~~ ^{is} was talk'd of proves that certain; and therefore, evident and true; he is so kind, as to answer his own Query: *Anthony Ashley Cooper* inquires, and Shaftesbury replies. Pilate's Question is here so v'd: and a Principle given by these cunning Scepticks to find out *any Truth, any Certainty*, that has the same Evidence in its kind, with this. "A Thing so much talk'd of." Were there no such things, as Evidence, Ceremony, Truth, he could not inquire about them; he asks for *something*, therefore they are Realities, they exist. He asks for nothing ~~that is true, certain,~~ and evident, that he does so ask.

The Substance of the Quotations from St. Paul, and the Thirty nine Articles, are part of the Argument it self, that is deduc'd in the following Pages.

St.

St. Paul denies that mere natural Reason can know the Things of Revelation, and the Articles deny, that Man can please God any way, but thro' Christ, apply'd by God's Grace, which is Scripture-Doctrine, and true. In the Preface and Book, the Author, methinks, should not have offer'd to reason, because he said himself that Reason is not sufficient; he begins his Preface with a *Contradiction in Terms*, "That every Book with impartial ^{or} ~~judges~~ will stand or fall by its own ^{or} ~~Intrinsic~~ worth or Imperfection"; the Word, Judges, implies it is to stand or fall by *Judgment* of it, not merely by *it self*; and the Word, *Intrinsic*, implies it is to stand by it self only, *and irrespectively* to any thing else. Such Reason is very insufficient; we may find so much Truth in this Writer, that he proves his Title, by neither having Reason, nor Revelation.

Page 2. of the Preface, he tells us, that he ^{intends} only to restore Re-

B " ligion

“ Religion to its primitive Purity and Perfection, which has been intirely disregarded in the present Controversy;” Whereas Dr. Tindal, one of the Controvertists, expressly refers his Design, in his Book, *Christianity as old as the Creation*, and in all his Writings, to the cutting off Innovations and Excrencencies, and restoring Religion to its primitive Purity: So the Pastoral Letters aim at the same Point, by reducing reveal’d Religion to the *Bible*, which is its primitive Purity and Perfection. The whole Pretension of Deism is, in their Sence, to restore the Purity of Religion to the Law of Nature: So that this Writer has not learnt the *Primer* of the Dispute.

Page 4. he affirms, “ That Reason is not sufficient to discover the Will of God, because, his Nature being incomprehensible, we cannot know his Will, nor therefore practise it.”

This, indeed, proves, that we cannot know nor comprehend all of God’s

Na-

Nature and Will, nor therefore practise all of it: but we know in Part, says Paul; and also, we obey, according to the Grace that is given to us: as we are finite Creatures, and God is infinite, we cannot, by any Method, perfectly comprehend him. But we can apprehend what he is pleas'd to declare and what we are able to conceive; Space is infinite; a Philosopher cannot therefore comprehend all of Space; but he can know Part of it, and argue, and apply, what he knows. It is so with our Knowledge of God. It does not follow, that because he cannot, being incomprehensible, in his Infinity, be perfectly known, therefore he cannot be known in any degree; it is a Contradiction, for knowing him to be incomprehensible, is in some degree knowing him, otherwise we could not even affirm that: and in this same Paragraph, this Author overthrows himself, for he quotes a Passage out of Job part of God's Will, declaring, that

In Search we cannot find God to per-
fection, to prove that we can know
the will of all. (which is to say in
to Part we may know and of that Part
found only by *Revelation*) In which he
equally goes on Page 43. *That external*
or traditional Revelation, to which is also a
*Trick. In the Title, he called *Revela-**
**tion at large*, it is not sufficient, nev-*
er appears in that Revelation shows its own
Insufficiency without Supernatural ac-
costance, or immediate Inspiration of
the Spirit, to judge of the Success, and
so that external Revelation cannot be un-
derstood without the internal Spirit's
but here, *Revelation* in Luther's *Table of*
External Revelation, apart from the *Spir-*
it which is so far from being Novel,
as he says after, that he owns it again
Revelation it self; and this is supposed,
and understood from the very Explan-
*tions of *Revelation*, that the Grace or*
spirit of God must accompany us to
give us a right sense of it; which is not
part of this present Edition. Between
that

Reason and Revelation among Christians; but the ~~christians~~ if they be Christians, for they are no Critics,) and they of that number who deny the Necessity of the internal Spirit to understand Revelation, the Quakers indeed have a peculiar System of interpreting that Light; but this will not the present Question; ~~that is~~ whether so much of God's Will as is necessary to a well-grounded Confidence in his Mercy and Acceptation, can be known, without his own Communication of it: "Revelation is not so ~~to us~~ till understood by the help of God's Spirit; therefore Men must frame their Minds and Appeals ~~by~~ what they rationally know of God to receive his Grace for knowing more by his Revelation. If the Author be out of the Question in the Preface, he probably goes wider from it in other Books; so that instead of following him Point, he leaves that to follow him: the merest Novice ~~now~~ ~~child~~ in his Catechism knows that

that God's Grace is needful to know
and to do God's will. This Author is a
very profound Scholar, to fetch out so
wonderful a Discovery; and an expert
Logician to make that his Subject
which does not belong to it; but he
was to prove Reason insufficient.

on Page 1. of his Book, he turns the
Disputes to a Law-suit, and tells us
of Rejoinders, and Sur-rejoinders;
Page 2, to a Picture, for, he says, there
are Master-strokes in it: Then he is
a Politician, for he says, Reason is an
Ally to Religion; Page 4, he divides
his Terms to explain them; Page 5,
he produces a Definition of *Sufficiency*
from what he calls a *Whiffler* in the
Controversy; he uses that for a Word
of Disgrace, whereas a *Whiffler* is one
that accidentally examines an Univer-
sity Student for his Degree; however,
was it a Word of lessening, it would
only shew, that he has lost the Spirit
by abusing it; and yet he gives Page 8
a Definition of *Sufficiency*, that is the
same word.

that God's Glory is necessarily
the same with his *Whiffers*, both amounting
to "a Power in all, at all Times,
" to know and practise Religion, & he
might have said, as far as it is re-
quired to the utmost of his Ability,
by a Progress in Good, and Avoidance
of Evil. This, indeed, may seem to
be included in the Word, Power, and
the Word, Religion, practicable divine
Obligation; but it is a close Phrase, and
shewing the Thing at once, should be
added, to illustrate the Definition, and
prevent Sophistry.

Page 8, he concludes the *In suffi-*
cency of Reason and Revelation from
Practice: Because, says he, what we
see and experience proves the Power
of Men, not any abstract metaphysico-
cal Reasoning: Yet all Reasoning on
the Powers of Men is not Metaphysico-
cal, and the Practice of Men may not
be according to their Power, and therefo-
re, not Religion. He confounds the
Power with the Act which it makes
Things, for many act less than their

Power,

power, otherwise than they judge most rational. Therefore this is no Proof of the Insufficiencie of Reason and Revelation in Religion, that Men do not practise it, because they may and ought so to do. Disobeying the Laws of a State does not prove those Laws insufficient, but the Actions only of the Guilty; it is the same with the Laws of God. And as no Laws oblige, till promulg'd, therefore the original Evidence of Scripture is given to be made known to all Men by Preaching, and Argument, the Holy Ghost cooperating: And it may be Want of that Grace, a Fault in a Person's Heart, as well as Understanding, not to believe them.

So that this Author might have spar'd Page 8 to the 12th, Deductions from the Practice of Men; Page 11, he says, it is almost impossible for a Man to hold that Balance between his Passions, and Power, which Religion requires. By the Words, *almost*
im-

impossible he owns; this is not quite impossible; tho' difficult, the Reward and Merit are an Over-balance. *Revelation* is not less true, tho' Men vary, or obscure it; he allow'd in his Preface, that a Book must stand by its intrinsic Worth; let him allow that to the Bible: *Mathematicks* are not false, because most are ignorant of them; *London* is a City, tho' some have not heard of it; and *this Writer may have Sense*, tho' we cannot see it in this Pamphlet.

Postscript; he remarks an Object on what Men situated under the Force of Imposture, Ignorance, and Credulity, may yet by mere Reason discern and practise Religion. He says, that is impossible. What he affirms is false; for they have yet *Poverty and Faculties* so know what a Vision not made known to them. A Country Peasant may have an *Mind* to know an *Act of Parliament* tho' hitherto he has not met with it.

Revelation requires nothing but what is practicable: But Men *desire their own Hearts*, and *caril* while they ought to *pray*: We could not know, that a Man's fearing God, and working Righteousness in any Nation would make him accepted, had not God himself told us so, in Christ: We might have reason'd with *doubt* about it: But the highest Evidence is in Revelation; and that *Revelation* is a *Matter of Fact*: However conceal'd or perverted in the Representation or Use, it is still not less a *Fact*: And it is vain to debate now, whether it be *necessary* or *sufficient*, when it is *Fact*, and ought to be receiv'd.

God spoke in divers Manners, and therefore all are some kind of *Revelation*. Reason itself is a Degree of his Voice in the Soul: The Works of God reveal something more of him; the Word of God more still; the Spirit of God adds to all these Methods, of Reve-

Revelation; and these Parts together, make the whole of it; to argue, therefore, whether Reason or Revelation be sufficient, is to argue, whether a Part of Revelation be the whole: This is the short State and Solution of this Problem; in which concise Light I do not find that any Disputant on either Hand has put it; and the Evidence that these Parts are Revelation is to be judged by the common Criterion of Truth, Self-evidence; for Faith is by hearing, that is, by the Conveyance of the Senses first, and hearing, by the Word of God.

It was once true that God gave Laws to Men; therefore it is always true; no Time, Place, Persons or Circumstances can make that not to be, which is Fact. God's speaking to Moses was as evident to him as a Man's speaking to his Friend; Mens disputing about the Passage thro' the Red-Sea, no more proves, he and his People did not pass it,

than it proves; therel never was a
 Anti-Sea; or One for calling *Doul-*
sham's confounding Divisions on Christ's
 Miracles can never make them not
 to have been done; The Deists deny-
 ing Scripture is no Argument that
 it is not Scripture; my wondering
 how they can deny it is no Reason
 to them, against the Fact, that they
 do deny it. Sufficient or not, in
 Mens wrangling, necessary or not,
 it is true, it is from God; where is
 Evidence of that equal to my speak-
 ing and standing in this Congregati-
 on; and *growing*; for their Eyes, hand
 Ears, and Senses, of more, and male
 pre-judic'd, and more diff'rent, and
 vs. wiser and honest Persons, which
 for God, and Christ's speaking, has
 caus'd me to think of this present Mo-
 bument; evild New favour he is in
 here is the *magnum* Castle in the
 back of *Revelation*; It is more
 forc'd for every man those who
 acknowledge not know him, may know it
 sometime; it is not impossible, and
 it

it is the Business of Preachers, and
all Christians, to make the Ignorant,
that is, the Unbelieving, acquainted
with it. The Spirit of God teaches
the things of God; he that doth the
Will shall know of the Doctrine;
wherefore let a Deist say his Prayers,
and practise the Laws of the Gospel,
and God will give him Grace to be-
lieve. Faith is said and presum'd in
Scripture to be a Grace of God; and
he may take himself for a Wit, and
a Scholar, and a Philosopher; for
putting off Conviction, to quibble
and sophisticate, when it is only
his Ignorance or Depravity. Let
him implore God in Christ to open
the wondrous Things of his Law,
and he will see them; but if he be
not inclin'd to supplication, and prac-
tise it, he never will believe it, and
will suffer for Want of Grace. Bene-
ath these Studies, that was the
good old Divinity. Let a Deist con-
fess and repent of his Sins, and the
old Religion is in him.

will soon find a Saviour needful, and will say; *Lord, I believe, HELP THOU MY UNBELIEF.* Where will they have Comfort on their Death-beds, or in Distress, or ill Conscience? Their own Reason yields it not; the more they think, the more they are entangled: Let them try the Experiment; go out of their dear boasted Selves to a better Self, *God and Jesus Christ;* this will sanctify the Beast to a Sacrifice, bruising the Heart on the Altar of Contrition, and wounding it with the *Stimulus* of holy Compunction.

False Judgment of Revelation is not the Falshood of Revelation itself; Page 17, this Writer tells us, that "Written Tradition is liable to Change, Error, and Misunderstanding; but so also is internal Revelation possibly obnoxious to Uncertainties;" and this would hold equally against both: He says, the *Revelation must be a clear and distinct*

tinct Conveyance of the Will of God; so is the Scripture, when known and understood; and till then, his internal Revelation is not sufficient; Page 23, he infers, that since God is infinitely good, and wise, and powerful, it was *impossible* for it not to be truly convey'd; therefore the written Word is not *sufficient Revelation*, because possibly that might be corrupted. But the *internal Testimony* may be *imagin'd* also, when it is *not*; and none pretends written Revelation is sufficient without God's Spirit. He encounters his own Shadow; this is not the Question: That is, whether the Scriptures be *Fact, True and Divine*.

By insisting Page 24, on *Infallible Conveyance of Revelation*, he destroys his own *internal Revelation*; for that is not *infallible*: And drives his Readers to the Church of Rome, like the *Herd of Swine* into the *Waters*: Page 25 to 31, and so on, de-

desiring why the Evidence of Re-
velation ought to reach farther than
Probability, or Testimony, (for he
makes the taking of Revelation on
the Credit of *Witnesses*, taking it on
Probability) he is *superfluous* in Cri-
ticising so long another Author's Sys-
tem; when that is not the Princi-
ple of Christian Belief, the Credit of
Witnesses is only Part of the Evi-
dence of Revelation: Not the whole
Evidence, so that Probability is not
all the Proof of *Revelation*; and yet
he should not call Testimony, as he
does, Probability only, at large, be-
cause himself makes the *Testimony of*
the Spirit sufficient, which is more
than Probability. By this he con-
tradicts himself, and overturns his
own Scheme; for the *Spirit beareth*
Witness with our Spirits, then we are
the Sons of God. Those fallible, tho'
deceivable we are, yet Men have
Self-Evidence the Evidence of Sense
that they are not deceivable; and

and the Possibility of Uncertainty may lie as much on the side of external, as internal Revelation; as this Writer absurdly clashes one with the other, when they belong to each other, as parts, especially, here, where the Gospel is publickly preach'd, and confess'd. Other Places are secondary to the Question, and their present Unbelief is no Reason, why they *should* not believe, when inform'd. God neither did, nor was he oblig'd, to reveal himself fully at once. In the whole Duration and Extent of the World's Religion, as well as Mankind, is consistencie. Nor is this weaken'd by the Apostle's Definition of Faith, that it is the *Evidence of Things unsee[n]*; That is not an universal Definition of Faith, but of that kind of Faith, which he there describ'd, explaining himself by the other Words, in the same Verse, that it is the *Substance of Things hope'd*, by which, compar'd with the

following Verses: he declares, richar
has spoke the truth of the Belief of Christ
soe comly among the Patriarches, for
by this, I say unto the Elders whiche
are good Report, with the particular of
Abraham, Lot, &c. evide[n]t them
Christ was unseen, yet they believed
him to come, from the strenght of his
Promise; to them, Hebrews was ins-
erted, yet they believ'd it by their Faith;
therefore go on to it, at their Belief of
God's Promise v[er]y Christ and His
serv[ant], I have the Evidence of Things not
seen. So he purposed and the Apostle
applies what I spake to Christianhood
etc. But that this Definition was not
soe signifi[n]c to mean in all Faith, as appears
by this, that the Apostle did diffi-
culty of Christ, in which he was in full
Faith, and visible had Faith in him.
That he was personally the Christ.
Their Faith was not the Evidence of
Things unseen, because, they saw him,
and saw his wonderful Works. also
likewise they who believ'd in Christ
upon

upon Earth or the Sights of his Works; and they who believed had but one View of the Passage thro' the Red Sea, while his Supernatural Actions in Egypt could not be said to give men too have such a Faith as that the Apostle mentions, calling it the Evidence of Things unseen. At first it was the Evidence of God's invisible Nature, or of Christ to come, or Heaven; it is of Things unseen, but the original Evidence of the Christian Religion was that of the Senses of the Eyes and Ears and bodily Organs; Thence would not believeth he told the Print of the Wounds of Christ. Therefore the Original Certainty of the Christian Religion is self-evident, which is the highest Certainty of Truth and Certainty of Higher than the Reasoning of Free-thinkers, which are not built upon self-evident Facts, but on their own Speculations, higher than the Mathematicks, whose Points, Lines,

Substances, Solids, Angles, and Quantities, are not in Nature, are not
 Real Beings, but supposed only by the Reason. And this Original Self-evidence of
 Selfe-vouches for the Christian Religion, is now taken as from those Persons most
 likely that had it : It might as well have been that of any other Person.
 The same Evidence would have been
 Convincing to all Persons at all
 Times : Therefore it is a kind of
 Evidence that is not built on their
 Testimony, so much as the Testimony
 of Sense in general. It was then
 sensible beyond doubt, what who so
 ever can never be made to be otherwise,
 so that now it is the same, for it
 can't be altered : Therefore it is no
 way the same sensible self-evident
 Proof of Christianity. Here the Devil
 is defeated : He must change the
 East, or we have the same Demon-
 stration now of Christianity on that
 Earth, as when it first appeared.
and the whole Power of the Devil
 against the whole Power of God
 is overthrown.
 And

In Page 33. We are told, that Christian
ity has not answer'd the end of it,
the Reformation of the World; and
that the voluminous Disputes about
it are not to be the necessary Ob-
ject of every Man's Consideration.
In answer to this, we can not di-
rectly say, how far Christianity has
reform'd the World: for it is the
sudden Life with Christ in God, and
many have been better'd by it, that
are obscure and unperceiv'd. It
has not had its proper heavenly Effet
on Mankind, and it is, in it self,
conducive to raise human Nature
to the highest Perfection. The
Faults of Men are suppos'd, cau-
tion'd against, and predicted in it:
the Gospel says, and owns, that few
would have Faith, and that the Lord
of many shax'd cold; it is propos'd,
for a instant Check on Vice, and
Growth in Virtue, and is not self
fitted admirably to produce that
Consequence, and *not* of good
use.

And

etc Articles for prolix Disputes, search
the Scriptures; which cannot soon may,
read, or hear, the Testament: Men
spend their time on that
which they spend ill or vainly;
there is the needful of Religious
Controversies of Men are not ne-
cessary. But to the reading of the
Gospel. Men are oblig'd to that,
but not to read all Controversies.
It is impossible; none is bound to
an Impossibility; therefore the Word,
provo. all things, must be meant
to your Power. There is not a
Christian in the World, Master of
his Senses, and Judgment, that may
not easily understand the Bible
and Testament, in a short Time:
let him endeavour it: it is his
Duty to endeavour it; otherwise, he
is not honest or sincere in his Inten-
tion to know his Religion.
It is not essential, that the Con-
veyance of Revelation should not be
subject to Doubt, but only that it
should

should not be subject to reasonable Doubts; Men doubt of it before they examine, and find in thus, then they no longer waver in the Faith, but come to be rooted and grounded in Love. They may have St. Paul's Plerophory, his Assurance, his Certainty, for the Promise was to our Fathers, and to their Children, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. And the State Objection, [Page 40] that God did not give this Revelation to all, has no force: for God designed it to all; Christ dy'd for all, and order'd his Disciples to preach it to all Nations: with this their Faith, That the Fault of Revelations, is in all Men in this World do not bear it, and know it, who do not believe it, and is false in Facto (Nay, fibro) never

there was a Country without God's
Revelation, in Conscience, in Prudence,
or in his Word; one is a Part
of the other: and none have his
full Revelation without his Word.

Page 45. he tells us, "The Op-
inions of Men differ about Reli-
gion, and therefore, not Reason,
nor external Revelation, are suffi-
cient, but the *Internal*."

In Reply to this, I observe, that
they differ as much about the
Internal as the *External*; so that,
if this has Force, it cuts both ways:
but all Christians agree, and none
differ, in this Creed, "That Christ
is the Messiah, the Great Prophet,
the Son of God, and that his
Will is their Law: that the New
Testament in general commands
that Will, and that to believe and
practise that, is their Obligation;"
point me out a Christian that differs
from another in *that Faith*, or the
Manner of interpreting and apply-
ing

ing some Particulars of that general Idea may differ, but they agree in that universal Belief: Arians, Socinians, Papists, Protestants, Churchmen, Dissenters, all agree and unite in the Creed aforesaid.

And if they disagreed in that, nay, if none believ'd it, (was that possible, which it is not nor ever can be) it would not be the Fault of *Revelation*, but their own *Fault*; it would still be equally true and good in it self, for the Opinions of Men affect not the Nature of Things.

At Page 148. this profound Reasoner, at the Conclusion of his *Spider's Web*, tells us again, what he said before, (lest the Proposition, being light, should be blown away) that, therefore, that is, for his Reasons aforesaid, which are shown to be none, it follows, that neither Reason nor *Revelation* are sufficient, but internal Inspiration. Yet his *internal Revelation* may be subject to the very

E same

True, In sufficiency, and his confounds
 all Ideas with language by the Terms
 hee by Associationes his internal Inspiration,
 as both Reason and Revelation;
 It must be judg'd in a great measure
 by natural Reason it self; and by the
 Revelation of God to the Soul only
 as I have shew'n, in Part of
 Revelation, and this Authors disputis
 gravely whether the Part hee intended,
 which is the whole of this Discourse:
 And indeed, any Part of that is as
 good as the whole, and the whole is as
 just as much as may bee off it.
 The Text hee quotes, is the greate
 in Spirit of God is necessarye containing
 all the Things of God, "I doe now,
 therefore, cast in them Internal Inspiration
 hony, because that every Text is the
 summe Truth, and there is none else, and
 All the report of chace and lightlike
 Propositions, &c, that without God's
 Revelation, bee generall & true, & true
 & true, know god & things of God;
 which is true, but not true of in
 ternal

the ^{scriptural} Revelation only, nor indeed
editions by the Evangelist, & that
the Internal Spirit interpreted, & that
this amounts to no more than the
Quaker's Light Within, which either
supposes the Scripture Knowledge v^ef
the Scripture Promise, or else is a false
Vapour, and goes out in darkness: which
is such expiring snuff of this Author's
Candle, that would have lasted longer
^{had it been} if Buxbee an Infidel in a Qua-
ker's Coat, & James Naylor translating
Scripture sets but a poor set of books
in Dr. Tindal, in his late Ap-
ology, gives a kind of Summary
of the main Arguments for Christi-
anity: Dr. Tindal has not prov'd his
thesis, that Christianity is nothing but
the Law of Nature; it has added
several Duties, which tho' positive,
are yet moral, for to obey the Law
of God is the moral Obligation. Dr.
Waterland has labour'd to vindicate
Scripture, & perhaps would do so
well

would be more convincing to their Readers.

Let our Prayers be address'd to God in Christ to impart that *Grace of Faith* to the Unbelieving, and that *Ghostly Strength of it* to the Believer, which no Reasoning can fully bestow, and let us to shew our Charity conclude with that Collect to obtain it at the Throne of Grace,

Blessed Lord, &c.

10 JY 57

N. B. It is appeal'd to the learned World, on comparing this *Lecture* with any thing written by the Bishaps and Clergy on this Subject, whether they are not something oblig'd to it.

F I N I S.

their
to
hat
be-
gth
no
ow,
ari-
ect
of

l
—
on-
ure
ops
her
it.